

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING BOARD

*Amended*

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wisconsin Statutes, a regular meeting of the Brown County Criminal Justice Coordinating Board was held on September 13, 2018 at 7:30 am in the Karen H. Dorau Memorial Conference Room at the Brown County District Attorney's Office, 300 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

---

<b>Members Present:</b>	Judge William Atkinson Human Services Committee Rep. Joan Brusky District Attorney David Lasee Probation and Parole Rep. Jennifer Hornacek Citizen Rep. Tim Mc Nulty	Jail Captain Heidi Michel Public Safety Committee Rep. Pat Buckley County Executive Troy Streckenbach Human Services Director Erik Pritzl Citizen Rep. Christopher Zahn
<b>Members Excused:</b>	Sheriff John Gossage Public Defender Jeff Cano	Citizen Representative Bob Srenaski Green Bay Police Chief Andrew Smith
<b>Others Present:</b>	Treatment Court Supervisor Mark Vanden Hoogen Family Services Rep. Angela Steuck Supervisor Megan Borchardt Jail Lieutenant John Mitchell	

---

1. **Call Meeting to Order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Judge Atkinson at 7:30 am.

2. **Approve/modify Agenda.**

Motion made by Erik Pritzl, seconded by Tim Mc Nulty to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **Approve/modify Minutes of July 12, 2018.**

Motion made by John Mitchell, seconded by Erik Pritzl to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **Jail population numbers (Sheriff).**

Lt. John Mitchell introduced Jail Captain Heidi Michel to the group. He informed the jail is currently at 92% capacity with 25 inmates being shipped out.

5. **Criminal Justice System Efficiency Improvement Work Group (Supervisor Brusky, Bob Srenaski).**

Joan Brusky informed a meeting was held on August 30 which was attended by 8 people; however, one person has now decided not to participate on the work group. She said the work group was unaware that the membership had to be approved before they could meet, but the meeting did happen and there was a power point presentation by Bob Srenaski and they discussed some of the issues outlined. They now have a list of members for approval by Judge Atkinson and after that is done, the work group will schedule another meeting.

Judge Atkinson referenced an e-mail from Corporation Counsel that outlined some concerns with the legality of the group being set up. Corporation Counsel indicated that he wished to get clarification from the County Board as to what the regulations should be on subcommittees of committees, especially with regard to costs and expenses and there were also some concerns as to who was going to be participating in the work group. Corporation Counsel ultimately asked that the work group be held in abeyance until some of these things are ironed out. The other concern of Corporation Counsel was that he had reviewed minutes of earlier CJC minutes and there was an indication that the work group would be held in abeyance at this time while waiting to see if the Criminal Justice Department is approved. Judge Atkinson continued that he brought this up at the judge's meeting and there were some concerns regarding the work group and what direction

they are going and what they plan to do. It was indicated that the judges do not know enough about the group yet, but it appears to be a group that is going to be highly driven by numbers and statistics. The concern of the judges is that while this committee is a cohesive group, it actually represents a few different branches of government and there are concerns that there may not be recognition of this when recommendations are made based solely upon numbers. If the work group is number and data driven, they may not be aware of the entire body of case law and statutes that need to be complied with in operation of the courts. The judges are asking that the work group hold off until Judge Atkinson has a conversation with Srenaski so he can find out what exactly the intent and goals of the work group are to be sure the work group understands the judges' position concerning any directives that would attempt to alter the court operations without input from the judges as to what is required by statute and case law.

Brusky informed they were going to wait on this, but at the August Public Safety Committee meeting, they were given repeated direction to get started and they want the work group to fall under the new Criminal Justice Department, so they went ahead because it was asked of them to do so. The meeting was then incorrectly held because the membership was not approved, but the work group did not know that they were supposed to do that and she apologized for the oversight. The work group does have a mission, a charter and the proposed membership as well as the cost and equipment that will be involved. The group will be data driven only; they do not intend to make any demands or anything of that nature – they are just a volunteer group that has no ill intent and they have said that they can be disbanded if the Chair of the CJCБ wishes to do so. Judge Atkinson assured the judges never felt there was any ill will; they just became concerned when they received the e-mail from Corporation Counsel. Before the proposed members are appointed to the work group, Judge Atkinson would like to have a discussion with Corporation Counsel to be sure the work group and its membership is proper. Brusky assured the work group will go through the proper channels on this.

Judge Atkinson said another concern was taking away employee work time by those employees on the committee. Brusky acknowledged that there could be a cost for this and she had talked with County Executive Streckenbach who informed her there were some funds that may be available, but she pointed out a number of those on the work group are volunteers and others are department heads. County Executive Streckenbach said there were conversations about how the work group was being formed and the requirements for open meetings and concerns of what the workload would be of staff that is outside of their normal mission. Buckley said prior to the agenda for the work group meeting coming out, he had concerns about open meeting requirements and he also has concern that the CJCБ approved the work group, but the work group does not really have a mission and based on the work group's agenda, it appeared to be what the CJCБ is working on. He feels it would be counterproductive to have a workgroup working on the same things the CJCБ is working on. In addition, Buckley said so far it seems the work group is taking a shotgun approach to getting information from all different angles and while he can appreciate that, looking at the judicial side and jail side, the numbers do not tell everything. Numbers do not necessarily tell what the problem is and, in addition, the work group would not know if there are certain contracts that are being renegotiated so that information would be flawed as well. Buckley said the proposed membership of the work group does not include anyone from the Sheriff's Department or jail. A group that is solely data driven will not tell the whole story and will bog us down. Streckenbach said the original intent of the work group being formed was to dig into the numbers. Srenaski is a citizen who is trying to do something good and he was given enough leeway to take a path. As the work group moved forward, it was realized they were not following the appropriate guidelines of how we operate as a government so it was brought back in. There are concerns by the judges, Corporation Counsel and the Public Safety Committee and those concerns are all being addressed. Streckenbach said Judge Atkinson is ultimately going to be appointing the members to the work group and he can make his concerns very clear to the work group. Streckenbach said Srenaski is doing his best but noted that he has not worked within government before. After all of the concerns are addressed, this Board can reassess this and decide whether the mission of the work group is really what the CJCБ wants because in the end it is the CJCБ that will decide whether the work group moves forward. The concern seemed to be that the work group was going to be required to do a lot of ground work outside the CJCБ meetings and that was his concern.

Judge Atkinson said he was glad Srenaski asked to meet with him to educate him on what direction the work group intends to go. Brusky said that just because the work group intends to produce data, it is up to those that receive the data to interpret it. The work group wants to produce the data that will be helpful to the county. She added that in September, 1992 there was a resolution establishing the CJCБ and the recommended duties included to form technical work groups composed of county agency staff and other relevant public and private sector persons to develop and refine new policies and program initiatives.

**6. New Treatment Court Grant Project: Family Drug Treatment Court Proposal (Erik Pritzl, Mark Vanden Hoogen).**

Pritzl informed there are not any updates to the new treatment court grant project other than what was discussed at the last meeting, however, there is an overall update on TAD grants. Treatment Court Supervisor Mark Vanden Hoogen said the county is currently in year three of a five year grant cycle that provides funds to the heroin and drug treatment courts. Each year there is a non-competitive grant that needs to be submitted that requires a lot of information and he will be reaching out to some of the members of the CJCJ for information and also talking to Judge Atkinson about a letter of recommendation. This grant is crucial to the treatment courts and covers approximately 60% of the overall expenses of the treatment courts.

**7. Youth Correction Update.**

Pritzl said he asked this item to be included on the agendas because there are a lot of changes going on in this area, but the rules for a facility or program design have not been established. DA Lasee said he is on the work groups for facility and programming and the recommendations for programming have been completed. Those recommendations will go to the Department of Corrections who will make a permanent rule, although they are now in the process of putting together temporary rules that will go into effect around the first of the year. Lasee will be attending a meeting soon to talk about site locations for the facilities.

Pritzl said they are curious to see where people want the facilities and how many and where they will be placed. Counties are in a holding pattern because they do not know what the requirements are, but there will be grants for construction released early next year with a fairly quick turnaround because they want the facilities up and running pretty quickly to replace Lincoln Hills and Copper Lakes.

Streckenbach informed the position of the WCA is that there is not enough money to build and the concern from the County's perspective is that in 2020 the State said counties have to have a location for the youth. Brown County sends about nine individuals a year to Lincoln Hills and this puts Brown County in an interesting predicament. At this time, he is not looking at Brown County becoming one of the locations for juvenile corrections. Pritzl added Brown County is more focused on secure detention and less focused on the correctional aspect, but there are some counties in this region that are interested in this and there are also some private agencies that are interested. Lasee said one of the big unanswered questions is if a facility could be used for both secure detention and corrections. Streckenbach said if dual usage is a possibility, he feels Brown County should go after it because there is a great opportunity to manage numbers from a long term cost standpoint. From a program standpoint, Pritzl said the preference is to keep youth in the county if possible.

Lasee said the dual role is very unclear at this time. The legislators who sit on the committee provided feedback that they were there to make changes that may be necessary to make the dual purpose model work. Lasee said it does not make sense to have a space with all the best practices programming for just the corrections population because the corrections population in the state is pretty small. It does not make sense to have the kids in secure detention stuck in a jail; it would make sense to have the kids in secure detention have the same best practices found in a corrections facility.

Streckenbach said from the WCA's perspective, there needs to be a push for more money as well as the dual use. If dual use is a possibility, Streckenbach questioned if we are looking at how to do that. Pritzl said they are not looking at that yet and noted it would not be desirable to have the corrections population overlapping with the secure detention population in the same units. The jail would have to be involved with determining how to keep the two separated. Streckenbach said there has only been one county that was willing to pay for guaranteed two spots. Lt. Mitchell said there are facilities in the state that do have non secure and secure facilities that do not necessarily share the same resources but are still attached.

**8. Future Agenda Items, if any.**

Judge Atkinson asked that if anyone has any agenda items they would like to see in the future, they let Michele Wallerius or County Board staff know.

**9. Other such matters as authorized by law.**

Judge Atkinson informed the judicial rotation has been changed to try to increase the flow of criminal cases. Beginning January 1, all eight branches will be conducting criminal court which should result in a flow increase of about 25%. The

judges understand that this creates incredibly great pressure on the DA's office but it should result in faster processing of criminal cases which will then help reduce the jail population.

At this time Mark Vanden Hoogen informed he had been contacted by individuals who asked for a review of the risk assessment tool being discussed and he presented a power point presentation on this, a copy of which is attached.

Brusky informed she currently has a communication into the County Board regarding an amendment to add a treatment court judge as a voting member of this Board and she conferred with Corporation Counsel on this and said they had also recognized some other issues within the CJCJ and they intend to do a joint amendment to the resolution for the formation of the CJCJ.

**11. Adjourn.**

**Motion made by Pat Buckley, seconded by Troy Streckenbach to adjourn at 8:25 am. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio  
Administrative Specialist